## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

www.usplo.gov

NXP, B.V. NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT M/S41-SJ 1109 MCKAY DRIVE SAN, JOSE CA 95131

**COPY MAILED** 

NOV 2 5 2008

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS** 

In re Application of

Hoogerbrugge et al.

Application No. 10/516,843

Filed: December 3, 2004

Attorney Docket No. ML02 0480 US

ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition under the unintentional provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed July 24, 2008, to revive the above-identified application.

There is no indication that the petition is signed by a registered patent attorney or patent agent of record. However, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.34, the signature of Mr. Mark A. Wilson appearing on the correspondence shall constitute a representation to the United States Patent and Trademark Office that he is authorized to represent the particular party on whose behalf he acts. If Mr. Wilson desires to receive correspondence regarding this file, the appropriate power of attorney documents must be submitted. A courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to Mr. Wilson, the petitioner herein. However, until otherwise instructed, all future correspondence regarding this application file will be directed solely to the above-noted correspondence address of record.

## The petition is **GRANTED**.

The application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the non-final Office action mailed, September 21, 2007, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three (3) months. No extensions of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Accordingly, the application became abandoned on December 22, 2007. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed May 16, 2008.

It is not apparent whether the statement of unintentional delay was signed by a person who would have been in a position of knowing that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. Nevertheless, in accordance with 37 CFR 10.18, the statement is accepted as constituting a certification of unintentional delay. However, in the event that petitioner has no knowledge that the delay was unintentional, petitioner must make such an inquiry to ascertain that, in fact, the delay was unintentional. If petitioner discovers that the delay was intentional, petitioner must notify the Office.

The petition satisfies the requirements of 37 CFR 1.137(b) in that petitioner has supplied (1) the reply in the form of an amendment, (2) the petition fee of \$1,540, and (3) an adequate statement of unintentional delay.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to Alicia Kelley at (571) 272-6059.

This application is being referred to Technology Center 2185 for further examination on the merits.

/SDB/

Sherry D. Brinkley Petitions Examiner Office of Petitions

cc:

MARK A. WILSON WILSON & HAM 2530 BERRYESSA ROAD PMB: 348 SAN JOSE, CA 95132